



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,485	09/13/2000	Manojit Sarkar	FORT-000900	2757
64128	7590	01/11/2007		
MICHAEL A. DE SANCTIS 756 HARRISON ST. DENVER, CO 80206			EXAMINER BATES, KEVIN T	
			ART UNIT 2155	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/663,485

Applicant(s)

SARKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-20-06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on October 28, 2006.

The Information Disclosure Statement received on December 20, 2006 has been considered.

Claims 15-18 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayandeh (6069895), in view of Rao (6674756) and in further view of Reichmeyer (6286038).

Regarding claim 1, Ayandeh teaches a computerized method for provisioning router configuration data for a network (Column 2, lines 25 – 45), the method comprising:

automatically determining a set of site reachability data (Column 2, lines 27 – 36); and

automatically generating a routing configuration for the router based on the site reachability data and the routing protocol (Column 2, lines 27 – 36).

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate providing a switch with a set of processing resources; allocating a subset of the set or processing resources to a virtual router created within the switch or reading a routing profile said profile including a routing protocol.

Reichmeyer teaches a system that includes configuring routers in a network that includes a configuration file for each router in the system that informs the router of its functions (Column 2, lines 45 – 59) and that the configuration file specifies which routing protocol that the router should use (Column 1, lines 19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Rao teaches a system where virtual routers are used in a router server instead of line cards (Column 2, lines 28 – 34), and providing a switch with a set of processing resources; allocating a subset of the set or processing resources to a virtual router created within the switch (Column 19, lines 28 – 52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Rao's teaching of virtual routers to replace the hardware of line cards in Ayandeh in order to allow the creation of software only virtual routers which allow the system to be dynamically altered with no hardware changes according to the availability of resources and demand on the system.

Regarding claim 2, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 1.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the routing profile comprises a site profile.

Reichmeyer teaches the routing profile comprises a site profile (Column 2, lines 58 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Regarding claim 3, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 2.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the site profile includes a site type.

Reichmeyer teaches that the site includes a site type (Column 2, lines 58 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh system in order to remotely configure a network device with a diverse set of attributes at the time the router is initialized.

Regarding claim 4, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 2.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the site profile includes a set of one or more site subnets.

Reichmeyer discloses that the site profile includes a set of one or more site subnets (Column 5, lines 30 – 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Regarding claim 5, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 1 and 15.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the routing profile comprises a global profile.

Reichmeyer discloses that the routing profile comprises a global profile (Reichmeyer, Column 6, lines 31 – 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Regarding claim 6, Ayandeh the computerized method of claim 5.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the global profile includes a default routing protocol for the ISP edge.

Reichmeyer discloses that the global profile includes a default routing protocol for the ISP edge (Column 2, line 65 – Column 3, line 6; Column 5, lines 47 – 50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Regarding claim 7, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 5.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the global profile includes a default site type.

Reichmeyer discloses that the global profile includes a default site type (Column 2, line 65 – Column 3, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Regarding claim 8, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 1, further comprising disseminating the set of site reachability data to other routers in a virtual private network (VPN) (Column 1, lines 32 – 41, where routing information is exchanged in the network (RIE)).

Regarding claim 9, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 8.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate wherein disseminating the set of site reachability data comprises reading a set of subnets for a site and creating static routes for the set of subnets.

Rao teaches reading a set of subnets for a site and creating static routes for the set of subnets (Column 11, lines 28 – 35; lines 53 – 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the router server in Ayandeh's system to use the teaching of Rao to allow manually configured static routes to be part of the configuration of the routing table in order to ensure the router tables can perform as network administrators desire as top priority.

Regarding claim 10, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 8, wherein disseminating the set of site reachability data comprises placing the set of site reachability information in a directory (Column 2, lines 29 – 31).

Regarding claim 11, Ayandeh teaches the computerized model of claims 1 and 15.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the routing profile comprises an OSPF profile.

Reichmeyer discloses that the routing profile comprises an OSPF profile (Column 5, lines 52 – 59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the

system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Regarding claim 12, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 11.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the OSPF profile includes a route aggregation policy.

Reichmeyer discloses that the OSPF profile includes a route aggregation policy (Column 5, lines 52 – 59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Regarding claim 13, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 11.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate that the OSPF profile includes an OSPF area defining a set of virtual routers, and wherein generating a configuration includes generating a configuration for each virtual router in the set of virtual router.

Reichmeyer discloses that the OSPF profile includes an OSPF area defining a set of virtual routers, and wherein generating a configuration includes generating a configuration for each virtual router in the set of virtual router (Column 5, lines 39 – 59; Column 6, lines 31 – 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Reichmeyer's teaching in Ayandeh, in order to allow the

Art Unit: 2155

routing protocol to be provided to the server after installation, in order to allow the system to be configured for its actual installed use and not have to be preconfigured by guessing where its going to be installed.

Regarding claim 14, Ayandeh teaches the computerized method of claim 1.

Ayandeh does not explicitly indicate further comprising receiving a selection of one or more virtual routers to receive the generated configuration.

Rao teaches comprising receiving a selection of one or more virtual routers to receive the generated configuration (Column 19, lines 44 – 52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Rao's teaching of virtual routers to replace the hardware of line cards in Ayandeh in order to allow the creation of software only virtual routers which allow the system to be dynamically altered with no hardware changes according to the availability of resources and demand on the system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2155

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB

KB
January 2, 2007

Bharat Barot
BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER